```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                  WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                      AUSTIN DIVISION
 3
   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ) Docket No. A 08-CR-92(1) SS
 4
   VS.
                              ) Austin, Texas
 5
   ARTHUR LONGORIA
                              ) August 12, 2008
 6
                   TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL ON THE MERITS
 7
                    BEFORE THE HONORABLE SAM SPARKS
                              Volume 2 of 2
 8
 9
    APPEARANCES:
10
   For the United States: Ms. Rrachelle R. Douglas
                                 Mr. Grant Sparks
11
                                 Assistant U.S. Attorneys
                                 816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1000
12
                                 Austin, Texas 78701
13
14
   For the Defendant:
                                Mr. Stephen M. Orr
                                 Orr & Olavson
                                 804 Rio Grande Street
15
                                 Austin, Texas 78701
16
17
18
    Court Reporter:
                                 Ms. Lily Iva Reznik, RPR, CRR
                                 200 W. 8th Street
19
                                 Austin, Texas 78701
                                 (512) 916-5564
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
    Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
    produced by computer.
```

```
THE COURT: All right. I've reviewed the defendant's
          1
09:00:08
             memorandum. I did some thinking about it last night. And what I
09:00:12
             will allow, of course, on the cross-examination is you can ask
09:00:17
          3
09:00:21
          4
             Ms. Olivo if she'd ever seen the gun they kept under the
             mattresses, if they'd ever seen the shotgun that was in the safe,
09:00:26
          5
09:00:31
          6
             or ever seen the shotgun in the closet, but limit your
          7
09:00:36
             cross-examination to the guns.
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, sir.
09:00:38
          8
                        THE COURT: All right. We're one juror short, so we're
09:00:40
          9
         10
             waiting for a few minutes.
09:00:52
09:01:49
         11
                        All right. Counsel, the jury's here. Are you ready?
09:01:52
         12
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, your Honor.
09:01:53
         1.3
                        THE COURT: All right.
09:01:59
         14
                        (Jury present.)
09:03:10
         15
                        THE COURT: Members of the jury, those of us that work
09:03:18
         16
             in the building -- it was built in 1931 -- are just thankful for
09:03:21
         17
             the days that we have air conditioning. And we have learned,
09:03:25
         18
             over the years, never to ask them to turn it down because usually
         19
             that ends up off. And this part of the building is the newest
09:03:29
         20
             part, redone 1995 for this courtroom. It's a great courtroom.
09:03:38
         2.1
             Much better than the other courtrooms that were built many, many
09:03:45
         2.2
             years ago with acoustics and that type of thing.
09:03:48
                        But these columns, I've tried to get the architects to
09:03:50
         2.3
             take the columns out so that I could -- I can't see all the way
         2.4
09:03:55
             down to the folks there and they can't see back, but that's the
09:03:58
         25
```

```
way construction was in those days. And they assure me that if
09:04:02
          1
             we remove the column, the building would fall down. So the first
09:04:06
             day of our new opening of the courtroom, we had a full audience,
09:04:12
          3
09:04:19
             all of the jurors here, many lawyers were going to select a very
             large jury for a multi-week case. And right in the middle of the
09:04:25
          5
             presentation, Judge Nowlin, whose office is right above us,
09:04:33
          6
          7
             flushed his commode, and we didn't know it but all of the
09:04:38
             plumbing there came right down the middle of this column.
09:04:44
                                                                           So
09:04:51
         9
             that we could do something about. We rerouted the plumbing. But
             for a while, every time somebody flushed the commode upstairs on
         10
09:04:56
         11
             2, we had to stop. So air conditioning and being cool is not
09:05:00
         12
             bad. Now, one of these days, I want to find out why I have to
09:05:05
09:05:12
         13
             watch an hour of each volleyball and get swimming. I don't guess
         14
             I'll ever get that response.
09:05:17
                        Since we met yesterday, has anyone attempted to talk to
09:05:20
         15
09:05:24
         16
             any of you about this case?
09:05:26
         17
                        JURORS: No.
09:05:26
         18
                        THE COURT: Have you talked to anybody about the case?
         19
                        JURORS: No.
09:05:28
         20
                        THE COURT: And have you learned anything at all about
09:05:29
         21
             the case, outside the presence of one another and this courtroom?
09:05:32
         2.2
                        JURORS:
                                 No.
09:05:34
                        THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Show negative
09:05:35
         23
             responses to all questions by all jurors.
         2.4
09:05:37
         25
                        Bring Ms. Olivo in, please.
09:05:42
```

- 09:06:51 1 Q. All right. And once you've been here in Austin, did you 09:06:56 2 establish a more close relationship with Loretta?
- 09:07:00 3 A. Well, a portion. So once she moved down here, yeah, I would 09:07:06 4 say we got closer.
- 09:07:07 5 Q. And give me an idea, like, how close you would say you are.
- 09:07:11 6 Do you see each other every day? Do you talk on the phone every
- 09:07:14 7 day? Like, what is the category of relationship?
- 09:07:16 8 A. No, not every day, but I mean I was -- I guess probably for about three months, I was going through a breakup and we would

talk quite a bit. We talked almost every day.

09:07:28 11 Q. Okay.

10

15

through.

09:07:26

09:07:39

- A. But I was, you know, working a lot, too, and that's when I would go to her house a lot and spend time with her, and she was kind of there for me through the breakup that I was going
- 09:07:39 16 Q. Okay. And let's try and narrow it down to the period of time that we're more concerned with as it relates to Jonathan 09:07:48 18 Lee, because I know, yesterday, you said that you had met him 09:07:51 19 through Loretta; is that correct?
- 09:07:52 20 A. Yes.
- 09:07:52 21 Q. And I believe, yesterday, you said you had known him about two years; is that correct?
- 09:07:57 23 A. Yes.
- 09:07:57 24 Q. Okay. And so, during that two-year period where Mr. Lee was 09:08:02 25 in the company of Loretta and you had met him, how often would

- you say you were seeing Loretta at that point in time? I mean did you go over to her house once a week, every day?

 3 A. Not every day. Probably maybe once or twice a week.
- 09:08:15 4 Q. Okay. And did she do the same? Did she come and frequent
- 09:08:18 5 your home?
- 09:08:19 6 A. From time to time.
- 09:08:20 7 Q. Okay. But you were more frequently at her home?
- 09:08:23 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. Now, during that two-year period, did they have a number of residences? And what I'm talking about is Arthur Longoria and
- 09:08:30 11 Loretta.
- 09:08:31 12 A. As far as living?
- 09:08:32 13 Q. Right. Did they live in just one place that entire two 09:08:35 14 years?
- 09:08:36 15 A. No. There was a couple of different places that they lived.
- 09:08:39 16 Q. Okay. What was the most recent place that they lived in
- 09:08:43 17 prior to when this search warrant was executed on their home in
- 09:08:46 18 December 2007? Where were they living, I'm sorry?
- 09:08:51 19 A. At the time of the incident?
- 09:08:53 20 Q. Yes, ma'am.
- 09:08:56 21 A. I know it's off Slaughter. I don't know what street it is.
- 09:09:00 22 Q. Okay.
- 09:09:01 23 A. But I know it's off Slaughter.
- 09:09:02 24 Q. Would you disagree if I said it was Howellwood Way?
- 09:09:06 25 A. No, I wouldn't, because I don't know exactly what street it

```
09:09:09 1 is, ma'am.
```

- 09:09:10 2 Q. Okay. But during the period of June to December of 2007,
- 09:09:14 3 you were visiting them at a residence that they were living at?
- 09:09:18 4 A. Yes.
- 09:09:18 5 Q. Okay. And during that period of time, would you say you
- 09:09:22 6 were over there frequently, the one to two times a week you've
- 09:09:25 7 indicated?
- 09:09:25 8 A. Yeah. I would say I was probably over there two to three
- 09:09:30 9 times a week.
- 09:09:30 10 Q. I believe on yesterday, you said during the two years that
- 09:09:34 11 you've known Mr. Lee, you'd seen him over at Loretta and Art's
- 09:09:37 12 house 30 times; is that correct?
- 09:09:39 13 A. Yes.
- 09:09:39 14 Q. Okay. And do you have any reason to believe that Mr. Lee
- 09:09:44 15 only goes there when you're there?
- 09:09:45 16 A. No.
- 09:09:46 17 Q. Okay. Do you have knowledge that he's there sometimes when
- 09:09:49 18 | you're not there?
- 09:09:51 19 A. Well, yeah, because I know at one time, I think him and his
- 09:09:54 20 girlfriend were actually staying there for a while.
- 09:09:56 21 Q. Okay.
- 09:09:57 22 A. I think they probably stayed there for maybe two or three
- 09:10:00 23 | weeks.
- 09:10:00 24 Q. Okay. So if someone lived with someone, would you say that
- 09:10:03 25 | that person was a pretty good friend?

- 09:10:05 1 A. Yes.
- 09:10:05 2 Q. Okay. Now, would it surprise you if I told you Art in his
- 09:10:11 3 interrogation tape told the cops he had only seen Mr. Lee ten
- 09:10:15 4 | times during the period of time he's known him?
- 09:10:19 5 A. Yeah. That wouldn't surprise me.
- 09:10:21 6 Q. Because based on what you're saying, both of those things
- 09:10:24 7 can't be true, correct?
- 09:10:24 8 A. Correct.
- 09:10:31 9 Q. Now, yesterday, you told the jury that you had never seen
- 09:10:40 10 any firearms at the residence that Art and your cousin were
- 09:10:43 11 | sharing; is that correct?
- 09:10:44 12 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 09:10:45 13 Q. Do you -- well, I'll ask specifically, were you ever
- 09:10:52 14 snooping around in their bedroom, the bedroom that they share?
- 09:10:55 15 A. No.
- 09:10:55 16 Q. Okay. So it wouldn't surprise you that the firearm was
- 09:10:58 17 | found in their bedroom underneath the mattress?
- 09:11:03 18 A. I wouldn't -- I don't know. I've never -- I mean I've never
- 09:11:07 19 known them to have guns.
- 09:11:08 20 Q. But you're not disputing that that's why we're here, that
- 09:11:10 21 police found firearms there, right?
- 09:11:12 22 A. No.
- 09:11:12 23 | Q. Because you don't -- you didn't go in there and look
- 09:11:14 24 underneath the mattress?
- 09:11:15 25 A. No. I didn't, no.

```
And would it surprise you that the police fond a shotgun in
09:11:16
          1
             Q.
             the safe at Arthur Langoria's bedroom?
09:11:19
                   It would surprise me. Yes.
09:11:23
          3
09:11:24
          4
             Q.
                   But you're not disputing that?
09:11:25
          5
             Α.
                   No.
09:11:26
          6
             Ο.
                 Pass the witness, your Honor.
          7
09:11:30
                                   RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION
             BY MR. ORR:
09:11:30
          8
09:11:31
          9
                   Would it surprise you to learn that Mr. Jonathan Lee
         10
             indicated to the jury that he really didn't know Art, didn't know
09:11:35
         11
             who he was, didn't know him very well?
09:11:39
09:11:41
         12
             Α.
                   Yes. That would surprise me.
09:11:43
         13
                   That he told the police he only knew him by Art?
         14
             Α.
                   Yeah. That definitely would surprise me.
09:11:46
09:11:49
         15
             Q.
                  Pass the witness.
09:11:51
         16
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Nothing further of this witness, your
09:11:53
         17
             Honor.
09:11:55
         18
                        MR. ORR: We call Sophia --
         19
                        THE COURT: I get a turn.
09:11:56
         20
                        MR. ORR: I'm sorry.
09:11:58
         21
                        THE COURT: Lawyers get a turn, and every once in a
09:11:58
         2.2
             while, the Judge gets a turn. May the witness be excused?
09:12:01
09:12:03
         2.3
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, your Honor.
                        THE COURT: You may be excused.
09:12:05
         2.4
         25
                        MR. ORR:
                                   I apologize. I'm just so eager, your Honor,
09:12:06
```

```
which is unusual.
          1
09:12:08
                         THE COURT: Now you can be eager.
09:12:09
                         MR. ORR: Yes, sir. Sophia Martinez, please.
          3
09:12:12
09:12:34
          4
                         (Witness sworn.)
                         THE COURT: If you'll tell us, please, ma'am, your full
          5
09:12:58
09:13:00
          6
             name and spell your last name.
          7
09:13:02
                         THE WITNESS: Sophia Martinez, M-A-R-T-I-N-E-Z.
                    SOPHIA MARTINEZ, called by the Defendant, duly sworn.
09:13:11
          8
09:13:11
          9
                                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
             BY MR. ORR:
         10
09:13:12
         11
                   Where do you live, ma'am?
09:13:12
09:13:13
         12
             Α.
                   Right now?
09:13:14
         13
             Q.
                   Well, okay. Right now.
         14
             Α.
                   Okay. I'm staying here with my aunt in Austin.
09:13:16
                   Okay. And where have you -- where did you live before that?
09:13:19
         15
             Q.
                   In Lubbock.
09:13:22
         16
             Α.
         17
             Q.
                   Okay. How long did you live in Lubbock?
09:13:22
         18
             Α.
                   Well, I've been in Lubbock all my life.
09:13:25
         19
                   Okay. So you got lucky and you got to move to Austin?
09:13:28
             Q.
         20
             Α.
                   Yes, sir.
09:13:31
         21
                   And did you -- are you related -- who's your daughter?
09:13:31
             Q.
         22
             Α.
                   Loretta.
09:13:38
                   Okay. And do you know Art?
09:13:38
         23
             Q.
                   Yes, I do.
         2.4
             Α.
09:13:41
                   Mr. Longoria, is that him sitting over here?
         25
09:13:42
             Q.
```

```
Yes, sir. He's my son-in-law.
09:13:44
          1
             Α.
                   Okay. And how long have you known Art?
09:13:45
             Q.
                   About five years.
09:13:48
             Α.
                   Okay. When is Loretta's birthday? Do you know what day it
09:13:50
          4
             Q.
          5
             is?
09:13:54
09:13:54
          6
             Α.
                   August the 29th.
          7
                   Okay. Somewhere in August. August 29th?
09:13:57
             Q.
09:13:59
          8
             Α.
                   Yeah, August 29th.
09:14:01
          9
             Q.
                   Okay. And do you know a guy named "Tater"?
         10
             Α.
                   Yes, I do.
09:14:07
         11
             Q.
                   And do you know him -- is it -- that's Jonathan Lee?
09:14:08
         12
09:14:11
             Α.
                   Yes, sir.
09:14:12
         13
             Q.
                   How do you know Mr. Jonathan Lee?
09:14:14
         14
             Α.
                   Well, I met him through Art and Loretta.
                   Okay. And do you know how long he's known Loretta?
09:14:17
         15
             Q.
09:14:21
         16
             Α.
                   About three years.
09:14:22
         17
             Q.
                   Do you know how long he's known Art?
09:14:25
         18
             Α.
                   About the same.
         19
                   Okay. So would you say that Art and/or Mr. Longoria and
09:14:25
             Q.
         20
             your daughter and Mr. -- and "Tater" were friends?
09:14:33
         21
             Α.
                   Yes, sir.
09:14:36
         22
             Q.
                   Okay. Let me ask you this: Has -- your daughter's never
09:14:37
             been convicted of a felony, right?
09:14:45
         23
         2.4
                 No, sir.
09:14:47
             Α.
         25
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Objection, your Honor. May we approach?
09:14:48
```

```
(At the bench, on the record.)
          1
09:14:56
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Your Honor, he has the same ability to
          2
09:15:01
          3
             run a criminal history since she's convicted of a theft, which I
09:15:04
             think I'll be able to ask her about.
09:15:07
                        MR. ORR: Of criminal theft?
          5
09:15:09
09:15:09
          6
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yeah.
          7
                        MR. ORR: I thought she didn't but -- okay. I'll
09:15:10
09:15:12
          8
             withdraw the question.
                        THE COURT: It's a little late to withdraw the
09:15:13
          9
         10
             question. But you certainly have the right to prove up the fact
09:15:14
         11
             that she has been. All right.
09:15:17
         12
09:16:41
                        MR. ORR:
                                 Well, she's got a misdemeanor conviction.
                        MS. DOUGLAS: A theft conviction.
09:16:44
         1.3
09:16:45
         14
                        MR. ORR: That's not why I'm asking the question.
09:16:47
         15
                        THE COURT: Okay. Question was, was she convicted of a
09:16:52
         16
             felony.
09:16:53
         17
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, sir.
09:16:53
         18
                        THE COURT: He put her criminal history in the
         19
             question. That doesn't mean that the person's wrong that she
09:17:01
         20
             just has a misdemeanor. But you can ask her if she can answer.
09:17:03
         2.1
                        MR. ORR: I don't care about the misdemeanor. That's
09:17:08
         2.2
             not my point. I'll ask her about the misdemeanor. I don't care
09:17:09
             if she's been convicted of a misdemeanor. That's not where I'm
09:17:12
         2.3
09:17:14
         2.4
             going.
         25
                        THE COURT: Well, I understand where you're --
09:17:15
```

```
MR. ORR: I have an idea but, you know, look, I'm doing
09:17:16
          1
             what I can do. This is not, you know -- so.
09:17:20
          3
                        THE COURT: Let's just go back and play like we're
09:17:22
09:17:25
          4
             lawyers.
          5
09:17:25
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, sir.
09:17:26
          6
                        MR. ORR: Yes, sir.
          7
                   (BY MR. ORR) Okay. To the best of your knowledge, Loretta
09:17:31
             does not have a -- excuse me, Ms. Garcia does not have a felony
09:17:34
09:17:38
          9
             conviction, correct?
         10
             Α.
                   Correct. She don't.
09:17:39
         11
                   But she may have a misdemeanor conviction for theft?
09:17:40
         12
             Α.
                  She might have. Yes.
09:17:43
09:17:45
         13
             Q.
                   I pass the witness. Thank you, ma'am.
         14
                        MR. SPARKS: No questions, your Honor.
09:17:55
         15
                        THE COURT: All right. May this witness be excused,
09:17:56
         16
             also, counsel?
09:17:58
         17
                        MR. SPARKS: Yes, your Honor.
09:18:00
09:18:05
         18
                        THE COURT: You may be excused, ma'am.
         19
                        MR. ORR: We rest, your Honor.
09:18:06
         20
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Government closes, your Honor.
09:18:15
         2.1
                        THE COURT: Members of the jury --
09:18:18
         2.2
                        MS. DOUGLAS: We don't have any rebuttal.
09:18:20
09:18:21
         23
                        THE COURT: I am going to put you in the jury room for
             just a moment.
         24
09:18:23
         25
                        (Jury not present.)
09:18:49
```

```
THE COURT: Does the government have any rebuttal?
09:18:53
          1
          2
                        MS. DOUGLAS: No. We do not, your Honor.
09:18:55
          3
                        THE COURT: All right.
09:18:56
09:18:57
          4
                        MR. ORR: We close, I guess.
          5
09:18:58
                        THE COURT: Okay.
09:18:59
          6
                        MR. ORR:
                                  We're ready.
          7
                        THE COURT: Everybody's closed but you need to renew
09:19:01
09:19:03
          8
             your --
09:19:04
          9
                        MR. ORR:
                                   I was about to do that. Yes, we renew our
         10
             motion for judgment of acquittal under Federal Rule of Criminal
09:19:07
         11
             Procedure 29, your Honor, on the basis of insufficient evidence.
09:19:10
         12
                        THE COURT: And the objection and motion is overruled.
09:19:13
09:19:19
         13
                        Are you ready for that? All right. John, tell the
         14
             jury that we'll be recessed for at least 30 minutes, to be ready
09:19:29
             to come back in 30 minutes.
         15
09:19:33
09:19:37
         16
                        COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Yes, sir.
         17
                        THE COURT: I'll have the Court's proposed charge to
09:19:37
         18
             you in a minute or two.
09:19:43
         19
                        How long do you wish to argue, Ms. Douglas?
09:19:45
         20
                        MS. DOUGLAS: May we get 20 minutes, your Honor?
09:19:48
         2.1
                        THE COURT: Sure. I don't ever limit argument.
09:19:50
         22
             usually recommend to the lawyers not to take more than 30. But
09:19:53
             20 minutes is fine.
09:19:59
         2.3
         2.4
                        MR. SPARKS: Can we have 30, just in case, your Honor?
09:20:01
             We'll try to use that judiciously.
         25
09:20:05
```

```
1
                        THE COURT: It took you -- so you want -- I don't care.
09:20:07
             Take 30 if you want.
09:20:12
          3
                        MR. ORR: I want whatever they want, your Honor.
09:20:14
             probably won't use it. But I think the jury gets enough of me in
09:20:16
          4
             15 to 20 minutes.
09:20:20
          5
                        THE COURT: We haven't had a whole lot of evidence to
09:20:21
          6
          7
09:20:23
             talk about in 30 minutes, but you can take 30 minutes.
09:42:32
          8
                        (Recess.)
09:42:41
          9
                        THE COURT: Ms. Douglas, have you had an opportunity to
         10
             review the proposed instructions to the jury?
09:42:43
         11
                        MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, your Honor.
09:42:46
         12
                        THE COURT: I'll take your objections, comments or
09:42:46
09:42:48
         13
             observations at this time.
         14
                        MS. DOUGLAS: No objections from the government.
09:42:49
                                                                              The
         15
             charge is fine, your Honor.
09:42:51
09:42:53
         16
                        THE COURT: Mr. Orr.
         17
                        MR. ORR: Your Honor, I have reviewed it and, more
09:42:53
         18
             importantly, Mr. Crawford has reviewed it, and we have no
09:42:55
         19
             objections.
09:42:57
         20
                        THE COURT: Do y'all need to take a short break before
09:43:00
         21
             we start?
09:43:03
         2.2
                        MS. DOUGLAS: We're ready, your Honor.
09:43:04
09:43:05
         2.3
                        MR. ORR: Sure. We're ready.
                        THE COURT: See if they're ready.
         2.4
09:43:06
         25
                        (Jury present.)
09:43:58
```

THE COURT: Members of the jury, I'm going to read to you the legal instructions I've prepared in the case. The lawyers have copies of the legal instructions and are entitled to comment upon them. So just sit back and listen. I will give it to you in writing. You'll have it in your jury room at the time you deliberate.

Members of the jury, you've heard all the evidence in the case. And I will now instruct you on the rules of law you must follow and apply in arriving at your decision in the case. After I read these instructions, the lawyers will have the right to make their final presentation, and thereafter, you will begin deliberation.

In a jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. The Court is one of the judges and you are the other. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to determine what evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration. It is also my duty at the end of the trial to instruct you on the law applicable to the case.

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. But in determining what actually happened, that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts, it is your sworn duty to follow all of the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction or to question the wisdom or the correctness of any rule I may state to you. You may not

substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath that you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors, and the parties have the right to expect nothing less.

The defendant, Arthur Langoria, has been charged with possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 922(g)(1).

This is a federal violation. The indictment is simply the description of the formal charge made by the government against the defendant; it is not evidence of guilt. Indeed, the law presumes the defendant to be innocent.

The presumption of innocence means a defendant starts the trial with a clean slate. You must presume a defendant is innocent throughout your deliberations until such time, if ever, you, as a jury, are satisfied that the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Unless you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, the presumption alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. In other words, the law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all. The government has the burden of proving each defendant quilty beyond

a reasonable doubt on the charge, and if it fails to do so, you must acquit the defendant on that charge.

While the government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, the defendant's guilt does not need to be proved beyond all doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the defendant's guilt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon common and —based upon reason and common sense, after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs.

In determining the facts, you must consider only the evidence presented during the trial, including the sworn testimony of the witnesses, exhibits, and any stipulations entered by the parties. Your determination must be based solely on the legally admissible evidence and testimony. Remember that any statements, objections, or arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence. The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or helpful to their side of the case, and in doing so, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice. In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in the case. What the lawyers say is not binding on you.

09:48:12 3 09:48:15 09:48:18 4 09:48:22 5 09:48:25 6 7 09:48:28 09:48:36 8 09:48:39 9 10 09:48:44 11 09:48:47 12 09:48:50 09:48:54 1.3 14 09:48:57 15 09:49:01 09:49:05 16 17 09:49:09 09:49:13 18 19 09:49:17 20 09:49:21 2.1 09:49:24 2.2 09:49:29 09:49:34 23 2.4 09:49:37 25 09:49:42

1

09:48:10

During the trial, I have sustained objections to certain questions and exhibits. You must disregard those questions and exhibits entirely. Do not speculate as to what the witness would have said if permitted to answer the question or as to the contents of the exhibit.

Also, do not assume that from anything that I may have done or said during the trial that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for the instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own findings as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant.

While you should consider only the evidence in the case, you're permitted to draw reasonable inferences from the testimony and the exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts that have been established by the testimony and the evidence in the case.

In considering the evidence, you should not be concerned whether the evidence is direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is a proof of a chain of facts or circumstances indicating that the defendant is either guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight you

may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence.

09:51:11

09:51:16

09:51:19

09:51:23

09:51:25

09:51:29

09:51:32

09:51:35

09:51:38

09:51:42

09:51:45

09:51:49

09:51:54

09:51:58

09:52:02

09:52:05

09:52:09

09:52:13

09:52:16

09:52:20

09:52:24

09:52:29

09:52:32

09:52:35

09:52:37

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the government has proved the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. And in doing so, you must consider all of the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all the evidence as true or accurate.

You're the sole judges of the credibility or the believability of each witness and the weight to be given the witness' testimony. An important part of your job will be making judgments of the testimony of the witnesses who did testify in the case. You should decide whether you believe what each person had to say, and how important that testimony was. In making that decision, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions: Did the person impress you as honest? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the government or the defense? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly? Did the witness' testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses? These are a few of the considerations that may help you to determine the accuracy of what each witness said.

In this case, the government called as witnesses law enforcement officers or agents. You are instructed the testimony

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

09:52:42

09:52:46

09:52:50

09:52:54

09:52:58

09:53:00

09:53:03

09:53:06

09:53:10

09:53:13

09:53:18

09:53:23

09:53:27

09:53:30

09:53:35

09:53:41

09:53:44

09:53:47

09:53:51

09:53:54

09:53:58

09:54:02

09:54:06

09:54:11

09:54:14

of a member of law enforcement should be weighed and his credibility evaluated in the same way as that of any other witnesses. The status of a witness as a law enforcement officer is not to be considered in weighing the credibility of that witness.

During the trial, you've heard the testimony of David
Berryhill and Daniel Jones, who expressed opinions concerning
firearms. If scientific, technical, or other specialized
knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or
in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified by knowledge,
skill, experience, training, or education may testify and may
state an opinion concerning such matters. Merely because such a
witness has expressed an opinion does not mean, however, that you
must accept the opinion. You should judge such testimony like
any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it, and give it
as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness'
education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given for
the opinion, and all other evidence in the case.

You must always bear in mind that the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling witnesses or producing any evidence. The defendant has a right not to testify in a criminal case, and his choice not to testify should not be considered as evidence of guilt or innocence.

Furthermore, I caution you, members of the jury, that you're here to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

09:54:18

09:54:21

09:54:25

09:54:29

09:54:32

09:54:36

09:54:41

09:54:44

09:54:48

09:54:52

09:54:55

09:54:59

09:55:05

09:55:08

09:55:10

09:55:13

09:55:16

09:55:19

in the crime charged from the evidence in the case. The defendant is not on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not alleged in the indictment. Neither are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case.

Finally, the punishment provided by law for the offense charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of the Court. If the defendant is found guilty, it will be my duty to decide what the punishment will be. You should not be concerned with punishment in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant, and it should not enter into your consideration or discussion.

Now that I have given you your general duties as jurors, I will instruct you on the law in the case.

You're instructed that Travis County, Texas, lies within the Western District of Texas.

You will note that the indictment charges the offense was committed on or about specific dates. You're instructed the government does not have to prove the crime was committed on that exact date, so long as the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant committed the crime on a date reasonably near the date stated in the indictment.

The term knowingly as used in these instructions means the act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident. It is reasonable to infer that a person

LILY I. REZNIK, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS (AUSTIN)

```
1
             ordinarily intends the natural and probable consequences of his
09:55:50
             or her knowing acts. You may draw the inference an accused
09:55:55
             intended all of the consequences which one standing in like
09:56:00
          3
09:56:04
          4
             circumstances and possessing like knowledge should reasonably
             have expected to result from any intentional act or conscious
09:56:08
          5
09:56:12
          6
             omission by the defendant.
          7
                        Along with these instructions, you will receive a
09:56:14
             verdict form. Answer each question using the following
09:56:18
          8
09:56:22
          9
             instructions of the applicable count.
         10
                        Count 1, Possession of a Firearm By a Convicted Felon.
09:56:25
         11
             Title 18, United States Code, Section 922(q)(1), makes it a crime
09:56:28
         12
             for a convicted felon to possess a firearm.
09:56:34
09:56:45
         13
                        For you to find the defendant quilty of this crime, you
         14
             must be convinced that the government has proved each of the
09:56:47
         15
             following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:
09:56:51
09:56:54
         16
                        First: That the defendant knowingly possessed a
         17
             firearm, specifically, a Hi-Point, Model CF380, .380 caliber,
09:56:58
         18
             semiautomatic pistol, Serial No. P870065;
09:57:04
         19
                        Second:
                                 That before the defendant possessed the
09:57:12
         20
             firearm, the defendant had been convicted in a court of a crime
09:57:15
         21
             punishable by imprisonment for a term in excess of one year, that
09:57:19
         2.2
             is, a felony offense; and
09:57:23
                               That the possession of the firearm was
09:57:24
         23
             affecting commerce; that is, that before the defendant possessed
         2.4
09:57:26
             the firearm, it had traveled at some point from one state to
         25
09:57:30
```

another.

1

09:57:35

The parties have stipulated that before the defendant is alleged to have possessed the firearm, Arthur Langoria had been convicted in a court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term in excess of one year, that is, a felony offense.

The term firearm means any weapon that will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile from the action of an explosive. The term firearm also includes the frame or receiver of any such weapon, or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer, or destructive device. The government is not required to prove the defendant knew the firearm had previously traveled in interstate commerce.

Possession, as that term is used in this case, may be of two kinds: actual possession or constructive possession. A person who knowingly has direct, physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it. A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and the intention, at a given time, to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it. Possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint. You may find that the element of possession, as that term is used in these instructions, is

09:57:36 09:57:40 3 09:57:44 09:57:48 09:57:52 6 7 09:57:56 8 09:58:01 09:58:05 9 10 09:58:11 11 09:58:14 09:58:17 12 09:58:20 1.3 14 09:58:25 15 09:58:30 09:58:35 16 09:58:40 17 18 09:58:45 19 09:58:50 20 09:58:54 21 09:58:59 2.2 09:59:03 09:59:08 23 2.4 09:59:11 09:59:16 25

present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had actual or constructive possession, either alone or jointly with others.

Question 1 asks: Do you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, Arthur Langoria, committed the offense of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, as charged in Count 1 of the indictment? Answer not quilty or quilty.

Your task is to decide whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed this crime. If you find the government has not proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, as charged in Count 1, answer not guilty to Question 1 on the verdict form. If you find the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, as charged in Count 1, answer guilty to Question 1 on the verdict form. And you answer no further questions.

Any verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree to the verdict. Your verdict must be unanimous on the count in the indictment. Your deliberations will be secret. You will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement, if you can do so without violence to your individual judgment. Each of you

25

10:00:47

must decide the case for yourself, but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, you may choose to reexamine your own views and even change your mind completely after discussing the evidence with other jurors. However, do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or the effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times that you're not partisans.

You're now judges, judges of the facts, and your duty is to decide whether the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Upon retiring to the jury room, you should first select one of you to act as your presiding juror, who will preside over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in court. A verdict form for each defendant has been prepared for your convenience. You will take the verdict form to the jury room. When you have reached the unanimous agreement as to your verdict, the presiding juror will write in the unanimous verdict of the jury in the spaces provided, and date and sign the form. You will then return to the courtroom to deliver your verdict.

If during your deliberations you should desire to communicate with the Court, please reduce your message to writing, signed by the presiding juror, and pass the note to the court security officer, who will bring it to my attention. I

25

10:02:18

will either answer your question in writing or bring you back to the courtroom for other verbal instructions. Bear in mind, however, you are never to reveal to any person, not even the Court, how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, on any count in the indictment, until after you've reached a unanimous verdict. And a place for my signature to send it to you.

The verdict of the jury is simply one page. It says, do you find beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant, Arthur Langoria, committed the offense of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, as charged in Count 1 of the indictment? You're to answer "not guilty" or "guilty" there, and have the presiding juror sign and file it. In addition to these instructions and the verdict form, you will get a copy of the indictment that was read to you at the beginning of this trial and a copy of all of the exhibits.

I permitted each of the parties to speak for 30 minutes if they need to. They could use all 30 minutes. If they don't, they're going to give you some time back. But before we start with that, then, I think what I'll do is -- because that will be a good hour of listening, I'm going to let you get into a short break, use the facilities, stretch, get your mind clear and then, come back, ready to listen to the lawyers.

There are two things, in addition, I want to tell you. Sometimes it's necessary to ask a question or send a comment to the Court. Let me tell you, the procedure I have to do is I stop

25

10:03:56

```
1
             whatever I'm doing, I call the parties back in the courtroom.
                                                                               Ι
10:04:00
             could be upstairs doing some other stuff, and so, it may take
10:04:06
                         The parties then are allowed to review what you have
10:04:10
          3
             written, and will advise me and suggest how I should answer it,
10:04:15
             and then, I will answer it generally in writing. The point is,
10:04:21
          5
             it takes time. Never stop your deliberations. Continue to
10:04:26
          6
          7
             deliberate. Many times, that question becomes unimportant later
10:04:31
10:04:37
          8
             on.
10:04:38
          9
                       The second is, you're to deliberate only when 12 of you
         10
             are present. If you want to take a break, and somebody wants to
10:04:42
         11
             go outside, or somebody wants to go to the restroom, everybody
10:04:45
         12
             stops talking about the case until the 12 of you are back so that
10:04:48
10:04:53
         13
             each one hears everything that is said.
         14
                       The time will be yours. If you decide to take a lunch
10:04:58
10:05:03
         15
             break, I need for you to write that you're going to be gone from
10:05:10
         16
             12:00 to 1:15, or whatever time it will be, so that I can have
10:05:17
         17
             the courthouse ready for you when you return. You do not have to
10:05:21
         18
             leave. You're welcome to stay in the jury room, if you prefer to
         19
             stay in the jury room, rather than to go to lunch. If you decide
10:05:27
```

Okay. Give you a short break.

(Recess.)

know what is the desire of the jury.

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

10:05:30

10:05:33

10:05:36

10:05:43

10:06:32

10:14:20

MR. SPARKS: Thank you, your Honor.

to go to lunch -- you don't have to go to lunch -- you're going

to be in charge of your own time from now, only I just need to

```
1
                        THE COURT: Mr. Sparks, you have the lectern.
10:14:21
             GOVERNMENT'S CLOSING STATEMENTS
          2
10:14:24
          3
                        MR. SPARKS: Mr. Orr, Mr. Crawford.
10:14:25
                        Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, yesterday and, I
10:14:27
          4
             suppose, this morning, I found myself thinking -- trying to get
10:14:33
          5
             -- trying to predict what was going through your minds as you
10:14:40
          6
          7
             drove downtown and got drawn into jury service for potentially
10:14:43
             being on a jury. And sometimes the lawyers -- at least I know I
10:14:48
                       I'll try to -- I'll tend to stare over at the jurors
10:14:52
          9
             do this.
         10
             and try to peek into your minds and see if I can read you, and I
10:14:55
         11
             could tell you that you've got pretty good poker faces, and you
10:14:59
         12
10:15:03
             don't tend to show your cards much.
10:15:07
         13
                        I can tell you what I imagine. I imagine you starting
         14
             your day, knowing you're coming to Austin, coordinating with your
10:15:13
10:15:18
         15
             respective maybe spouses, your children, your -- some of your
10:15:23
         16
             spoiled pets, just basically tending to all your normal
         17
             day-to-day responsibilities, coordinating with your work, your
10:15:29
10:15:32
         18
             job, your household, all these things. Some of you or several of
             you may have even done as Judge Sparks mentioned and tuned into
         19
10:15:37
         20
             the Olympics the night before last night and seeing these --
10:15:42
         21
             really, these inspirational not only stories but performances
10:15:48
         22
             that were based on hard work, commitment, dedication,
10:15:52
             accountability. Really, the world -- well, the world, the United
10:16:00
         23
             States is watching, and these athletes go out there and perform.
         2.4
10:16:05
             At some level, possibly to you, they are accountable if they fall
         25
10:16:10
```

short of the mark, alls they can really do is look in the camera or in the mirror and just sort of accept they went out there and did their best.

And so, I got to think about that and what a contrast we've got from what some of you may have tuned into to what you've tuned into over the past two days. You tuned into the Arthur Longoria show, and the game he plays is strikingly different. It's a game of deceit, it's a game of proactive avoidance of responsibility. And what did Arthur Longoria do? He did a couple of things that we know, and I'm not going to regurgitate all of them but just some things that he proactively did.

He had a cleanup effort that was maybe worthy of a medal, if one were given, for the type of game he's playing. He goes to David Lee and tries to get him to sign some sort of paper, presumably placing blame for the possession of the firearm on somebody else. What else does he do? Well, he's smart enough, at least in the interview with the officer, to avoid responsibility. And he's smart enough, convicted felon, to fudge and say, well, those were for -- and this is months, months later. Those firearms were for my wife's birthday. So he fudges there a little bit. Those items, I submit to you, are circumstantial evidence of his knowledge. He knows he can't possess a gun; that's why he's going -- proactively driving wherever the Jiffy Lube is to where David Lee works to get him to

10:16:14 1 10:16:17 10:16:21 3 10:16:22 4 10:16:28 5 10:16:32 7 10:16:36 10:16:41 8 10:16:48 9 10 10:16:53 11 10:16:55 12 10:17:01 10:17:01 13 14 10:17:10 10:17:15 15 10:17:21 16 17 10:17:27 18 10:17:32 19 10:17:37 20 10:17:42 21 10:17:47 22 10:17:52 10:17:57 23 2.4 10:18:00

25

10:18:04

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

10:18:07

10:18:12

10:18:15

10:18:20

10:18:24

10:18:28

10:18:33

10:18:37

10:18:42

10:18:46

10:18:52

10:18:56

10:19:00

10:19:04

10:19:08

10:19:15

10:19:21

10:19:25

10:19:28

10:19:33

10:19:39

10:19:44

10:19:49

10:19:56

10:20:05

sign whatever this piece of paper says, deliberately saying when he says on the interview because he knows as a convicted felon, he can't have a firearm. That is circumstantial evidence.

And then, you know, he stoops low enough to try to put on his wife, Loretta Garcia-Longoria. I'd submit to you that the defense has an equal right to -- where is Loretta Garcia? They have a right to subpoena witnesses. Where is she? Presumably, they have at least an equal, or maybe a greater, access to someone that is the defendant's spouse to get her here and tell you what, you know, allegedly she's going to say.

Now, and I say that not to be confrontational on this side of the table. Mr. Orr and Mr. Crawford are gentlemen lawyers. I don't begrudge the decisions they make in calling a witness, not calling a witness. You've observed our interaction with one another. It's courteous, it's respectful. Sometimes it may seem, as you watched us, a little lighthearted, but maybe that's gallows humor for the type of work we're in. But make no mistake about this case, it's about possession, but it's also -- it's about public safety. And the question -- the obvious question is, do we want a convicted felon to possess this type of a weapon?

It's not an antigun case. It's not an antigun case.

Many of you may be just as excited as others about opening day of hunting season. It's not an antigun case. It's an anti-felon-in-possession case. It's really just as simple as

```
1
             that. We've got Mr. Longoria admitting actual possession. We've
10:20:15
             got him in constructive possession in the bedroom of his home.
10:20:20
          3
             The uncontroverted evidence from Mr. Lee is that he sold the gun
10:20:24
             directly to Arthur Longoria. So the question becomes, is Lee
10:20:28
          4
             credible?
10:20:32
          5
10:20:34
          6
                       Just a few observations. Mr. Lee was unwavering in his
          7
             testimony on direct and on cross. He has -- I'll submit to you
10:20:38
             he has no axe to grind with Mr. Longoria. He tried -- in fact,
10:20:44
             he tried to mitigate things a little bit with Detective Skolaut.
10:20:48
          9
             Ultimately, he came out and told the ugly truth. He didn't want
         10
10:20:54
                          They were friends. You heard from the defense
         11
             to do that.
10:20:59
         12
10:21:04
             witness that he even stayed in the home for several weeks.
10:21:09
         1.3
             was an uncomfortable position for him to be in, but he came in
10:21:13
         14
             and did the right thing. He picked him out of a lineup. He just
10:21:19
         15
             as easily, I submit to you, could have said that he sold the guns
```

10:21:23

10:21:28

10:21:31

10:21:35

10:21:41

10:21:46

10:21:53

10:21:56

10:21:59

10:22:01

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

firearms on videotape. He hedges a little. He fudges a little.

A couple of questions, then I'm going sit down and Ms.

Douglas is going to speak to you, and Mr. Orr and Mr. Crawford will, as well.

to Loretta. Would law enforcement have been any the wiser? He

submit to you, he's a credible witness. He came in and told the

could have easily done that; but instead, he came in -- and I

truth. But I guess, more importantly, is the word -- are the

words of Arthur Longoria, himself. He admits possessing the

When you keep a gun under your bed, near your safe, and

1 \$1,500 in your wallet, who do we really think possessed that? 10:22:06 Ιs it is the wife that Arthur Longoria tells you didn't even know 10:22:12 how to shoot it, yet, they were intending to go out and have 10:22:14 lessons? Those are Arthur Longoria. On the interview tape, if 10:22:17 we're going to scrutinize credibility in every case, you need to 10:22:22 5 scrutinize the witnesses and the evidence. The evidence here I'm 10:22:24 6 7 referring to is the videotaped statement of Arthur Longoria. 10:22:29 says the firearm's there for home protection. Home protection, 10:22:32 8 10:22:38 9 you know, that's not a defense to actual or constructive 10 possession of a firearm by a felon. 10:22:43 10:22:46 11 Will it be important to some of you that, you know, he had it for home protection? I don't know. I doubt it. But if 10:22:50 12 10:22:56 13 he's so concerned about home protection, couldn't he have perhaps 14 taken that \$1,500 in his wallet and maybe 150 to 200-plus that he 10:23:00 10:23:05 15 paid over to David Lee, invest it in a security system? He could 10:23:10 16 probably buy himself a pretty decent alarm system and bar some 10:23:15 17 doors and windows for that amount of money. I submit to you 10:23:18 18 that's not what he was doing. He intentionally, knowingly 19 possessed the firearm. Thank you. 10:23:21 20 THE COURT: Mr. Orr. 10:23:25 DEFENDANT'S CLOSING STATEMENTS 2.1 10:23:29 2.2 MR. ORR: Your Honor, may it please the Court. 10:23:31 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, Mr. Sparks, Ms. 10:23:33 23 Douglas, this trial's been pretty short, shorter than we thought, 2.4 10:23:35 mercifully for you. The lawyers here, we always enjoy being in 25 10:23:41

10:23:45

10:23:48

trial and it's always -- it's a pleasure being in trial with Mr. Sparks and Ms. Douglas. As he noted, they're very courteous and I'm sometimes a little bit of a jerk, but I've been doing this a long time and I just can't help it sometimes. I'm a lawyer, what do you want? Doing the best I can do to be a real person.

evidence, and I want you to consider the indictment, consider the Court's charge, and you decide if the government has proven the allegations of the indictment that the federal grand jury returned against Mr. Longoria, beyond a reasonable doubt, and if they've done it within the terms of the charge the Judge just read to y'all a few minutes ago.

And as you go through all this, as the Judge and Mr. Sparks tell you, you're entitled to believe some of the witness' testimony, all of it, or none of it. So you've heard testimony from Mr. Lee, you've heard from Detective Skolaut, you've heard a couple of defense witnesses. You've heard the statement of Mr. Longoria when he was talking to the police. You heard -- gee, I don't remember all the witnesses, all the rest of them. Whatever -- not very many witnesses. But you have 12 recollections, 12 minds, 12 memories over there to remember all the witnesses and what they said.

But first, let's look at the indictment, and it charges that on or about December 4th, 2007, that Mr. Longoria, convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one

LILY I. REZNIK, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS (AUSTIN)

year, which he stipulated to that, did knowingly possess in and 1 10:25:21 affecting commerce a firearm, and that's the .380 that's in 10:25:24 evidence here. He's not charged with a shotgun. And then, the 10:25:28 3 Court says that he's in violation of 18 United States Code, 10:25:33 4 Section 922(g), some legal language that needs to be in there you 10:25:39 5 don't need to concern yourselves about. But let's look at how 10:25:43 6 7 all this came down. Just look at the overall case here. 10:25:46 That is that on December the 4th of last year, a raid 10:25:51 8 was conducted at the residence of Loretta Garcia, some other 10:25:55 9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

10:26:01

10:26:09

10:26:13

10:26:19

10:26:25

10:26:30

10:26:35

10:26:39

10:26:45

10:26:49

10:26:55

10:26:59

10:27:03

10:27:14

10:27:17

10:27:22

was conducted at the residence of Loretta Garcia, some other people, and Arthur Longoria. The police there find a couple of firearms. They found the shotgun, they found the .380. The .380's under the bed. The shotgun is in the gun safe. And they then do a firearms check and conclude that the .380, at least, comes — was purchased by Jonathan David Lee. And I didn't hear any testimony about a firearms check on the shotgun. And Mr. Lee told you about selling a .410 shotgun. And you heard the testimony about how a .410 does not look like a 12-gauge.

And I'm going to guess that being Texas that at least some of y'all know the difference between a .410 and a 12-gauge.

Mr. Lee, I think, even sort of admitted that maybe -- I mean one of his versions of his testimony that the .380 was for Loretta Garcia. And he tried to say the .410, I think, was maybe for Mr. Longoria, but that's not it. It's not there. Where is this .410 he claims he sold? Where's the firearms trace on the 12-gauge?

And if you remember when the officers, Detective

Balderama, that's another one, when he was asking Mr. Longoria 1 10:27:26 about the firearms, he seemed to be talking about the .410 and 10:27:30 The guns he's mentioning, he's asking, where did you the .380. 10:27:35 3 get them? Mr. Longoria says Jonathan David Lee. Well, he says 10:27:40 "Tater." He identifies as "Tater" sold them to Loretta. Loretta 10:27:45 5 bought it. There's something very strange going on here. 10:27:50 7 don't know if it's confusion, but the officer, I think, is asking 10:27:56 about the .410. You'll have the tape. At least Mr. Longoria's 10:28:00 8 talking to him about a .410 that Loretta purchased. But there 10:28:04 9 was no .410 found. And at no point does the officer say, wait, 10 10:28:08 wait, wait .410, what about a .410? What about the 12-gauge that 11 10:28:13 12 was in there? 10:28:20 10:28:21 13 Because if you remember, I was asking sequences. 10:28:24 14 did things happen? Because at the time that Mr. Longoria was interviewed on May the 2nd, the police had already talked to 10:28:29 15 Jonathan David Lee and already had the firearms trace on the 10:28:35 16

did things happen? Because at the time that Mr. Longoria was interviewed on May the 2nd, the police had already talked to Jonathan David Lee and already had the firearms trace on the .380, but they didn't have a firearms trace on a .410 because no .410 was found. But if they did one on the 12-gauge, we certainly haven't heard about it. So I'm really -- I'm confused about what's the story of Mr. Lee? If he sold a .410 and a .380 in August, what happened to the .410?

10:28:38

10:28:43

10:28:50

10:28:59

10:29:08

10:29:12

10:29:14

10:29:24

10:29:33

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

Now, you notice in the indictment Mr. Longoria's charged with possession on December the 4th of '07. In the Court's charge does tell you that you will note the indictment charges the offense was committed on or about specific dates.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

10:29:36

10:29:38

10:29:42

10:29:45

10:29:48

10:29:50

10:29:54

10:29:59

10:30:02

10:30:05

10:30:08

10:30:11

10:30:13

10:30:17

10:30:21

10:30:26

10:30:31

10:30:34

10:30:38

10:30:40

10:30:44

10:30:48

10:30:52

10:30:56

10:30:59

You are instructed the government does not have to prove the crime was committed on that exact date, so long as the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant committed the crime on a date, reasonably near the date stated in the indictment.

Now, that's for you to decide what's reasonably near.

And so, the police asked Mr. Longoria, they say, well, did you buy the gun? No. Loretta bought the gun. They tried to get him several times to say that he bought the guns. He's not charged with buying guns, he's charged with possessing guns, but they try to get him to say that, and he didn't say that. He did -- the officer said, well, I want you to tell me the truth. Did you possess the guns? Did you hand -- you know, he said, well, yeah, I did handle the guns, but he didn't tell you when. He doesn't say, on December the 4th of 2007, I handled the guns. Who knows when that was, if it even happened. Who knows what handle means. And it's up to you to decide even if you believe, in fact, he handled the guns, does that amount to possession under the Court's charge?

Now, we've proven a couple of things here is that Loretta Garcia does not have a prior conviction. She could have a gun. She could have all the guns she wants. And the government says, well, why isn't she here? Why didn't these lawyers bring her here? Well, do you remember the raid on December the 4th, 2007? Think about all the stuff that you've

heard. And sometimes people don't want to come to federal court.

They don't want to be here. They may have their own reasons for not wanting to be here.

So the government through its officers and agents and the Austin Police Department, they make a -- they do a raid on December the 4th of last year. They find some guns. They find several people. And there's pictures of the other people that were arrested or detained in that place because they took their pictures in that apartment on that date. So some months later, from December to March, I think it was maybe March 13th, but you'll probably remember it better than I do.

Detective Skolaut goes and finds -- based on the firearms trace, he finds Jonathan David Lee. And so, what does he do with Mr. Lee? He shows him what's been marked as Government's Exhibit 3. And what is Government's Exhibit 3? It's six mugshots, including Mr. Longoria's.

Now, let's think about how fair all this is. Now, supposedly, Mr. Lee knows Mr. Longoria and I think he does. I think they're, you know, at least -- I don't know if they were friends, but they sure know each other. And Mr. Lee, for whatever reason, is minimizing or covering that up. Okay. And so, here's this deal. Here you are. They find in a raid, they find some guns, they find a guy there that's -- one person's convicted of a felony, Loretta Garcia is not. Loretta Garcia can have guns. Convicted felon can't have guns. That's the case.

That's some statistics. That's what we hope -- what they hope is going to be a conviction.

So what do you do? You go out and talk to a guy, and you show him a photo lineup where the proposed defendant is in his little jail jumpsuit, along with everybody else in jail jumpsuits, and of course, he's going to know the guy. I think, you know, who knows what the exact details of that conversation were, but don't you think this sends a message to "Tater"? Don't you think putting this man in a jail jumpsuit and a mugshot and showing it to somebody sends a message? Yeah, this is the guy we want.

And I'm sure "Tater" wasn't too excited about cooperating with the government, but for his own reasons, whatever they may be, buying and selling guns, or whatever reason, because he finally said remember -- he and I went back and forth on cross-exam, then, after lunch, I think it was, the government brought him back in, he finally fessed up, yeah, I didn't want to get in trouble. He wasn't doing it because he's a good citizen. He doesn't want to get in trouble.

Now, who knows what it really was what he didn't want to get in trouble for because he's cagey enough to not fess up.

All he knows is Arthur Longoria, sitting over here behind some lawyers, next to lawyers, and "Tater's" roaming the streets free, buying and selling guns, and who knows what he's up to because I think that you got the idea, at least I hope so, that "Tater" was

not what we call a reliable, credible individual. He didn't want to admit he lied, but clearly he lied. And the government says, oh, well, he was just trying to help Arthur. I don't think that "Tater" -- you know, who knows, maybe he was. But the point is he lied. "Tater" is here to help "Tater." And "Tater" got influenced, he got the message. He may only be 23, but he's street smart enough to get the idea when he's shown a photograph of Arthur Longoria in a jail jumpsuit, oh, I get it, I get it, I know what I'm supposed to do to get myself out of trouble and keep myself out of trouble. He may not have been the brightest bulb in the chandelier, but I think even young "Tater" could figure that out.

So you think you look at the -- you look at all the evidence here. The government's case rests on the foundation of "Tater." That's where their case really comes from. That's the most important part of their case is "Tater," and he's probably the most unreliable foundation. He's a foundation of sand. The government has not built their case, not built their house on a solid foundation. "Tater" can't be believed.

Now, yes, Mr. Longoria is in that residence and these guns are there, so is Loretta. Now if you notice, Detective Balderama was questioning Mr. Longoria, he says, well, I think that the shotgun was right next to you. And Mr. Longoria said, no, it was -- he says they were both in the safe. As far as he knew, they were both in the safe. And in fact, if I understood

the officer's testimony, the shotgun is in the safe and the .380's under the bed. So the simple truth is, they were both wrong about where the weapons were, where the firearms were.

But because -- I think what Mr. Longoria says on the tape is, yeah, sometimes I'd go into the safe to get my papers and I might -- you know, maybe he's having to push it away or do this, do something like that to get to his stuff. It's a gun safe, a normal gun safe. Would it have been better and smarter for him not to have been anywhere on the same block with a firearm? Well, yeah, I think he understands that now.

But what are you going to say to people, what are you going to say to the wives of people who have a prior felony conviction, that is, any conviction for anything for which they got over a year? Are you going to say to them, ma'am, you can't have a pistol? You can't have a shotgun because we're going to put your husband in a federal penitentiary if you've got one? Well, that's basically what you'll be saying if you convict Arthur Longoria.

I mean it's a problem. It's a serious problem with the kind of crime that we've got on the streets, people need some protection in their homes. And for Mr. Sparks to stand up here and tell you, oh, well, he could have got a burglar alarm is ridiculous. I mean you might ought to have a burglar alarm, but our Constitution guarantees the right to keep and bear arms, and the Supreme Court recently reaffirmed that. So anybody who's not

convicted of a felony could have a firearm.

And he says, well, Loretta hadn't even learned how to shoot it. Well, I don't think it takes a whole lot of learning to learn how to shoot a .380. Maybe some, you should go to the -- you know, that's -- they never went to the firing range. She never went to learn how to do it. That's how interested they were in these firearms or how interested he was.

Watch carefully Mr. Longoria's videotaped statement, and if he, in fact, touched the .380, which is what he's charged for, he shouldn't have done that. He shouldn't probably have gotten close to -- in order to keep himself out of any trouble so he doesn't have to be here with lawyers. But the officer, if I recall the videotape, just asking about the firearms, and Arthur said, yeah, I handled firearms. And we don't really know if that's the .380, which is what he's charged with, or a .410, or a 12-gauge, or a BB pistol, or what it all is. I'm exaggerating a little bit, but lawyers do that.

So when you go back in there and you look at all the pieces of the picture puzzle that the government has tried to put together for you, if you see some of the pieces don't fit exactly, or some of them aren't the right color, then you need to find Arthur Longoria not guilty.

We're not here to speculate him into the federal penitentiary. We're not here to -- the Judge told you beyond a reasonable doubt and that's proof of a nature -- such a nature

10:40:50

25

10:40:52

10:40:57

10:42:39

25

that you would rely upon it without hesitance in the most important of your own personal affairs. So that means it's got to be pretty serious evidence because we're not here to speculate and say, well, you know what, I think he did it. I think he probably did it. Well, if you think he probably did it and that's it, it's your obligation to say "not quilty" because probably did it is not proof beyond a reasonable doubt. don't think -- that's probably one of the few things that the government is not going to argue with me about.

Ms. Douglas is going to get up here and speak, and I've known her a long time in state and federal court and she's a good lawyer. And I'm afraid she's going to talk you into or try -- I know she's going to try and I hope she doesn't talk you into believing that the government has proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt. And they want to win. Lawyers -- we just want to win. But it's up to you to look at this case and tell the lawyers whichever, whether it's me or Mr. Sparks and Ms. Douglas, that you're wrong, and I'm bolted to the other side based on the evidence.

is eloquent and persuasive. She's very good. You could see her down at the park over here, talking the bird down out of the trees. So I'm hoping y'all won't be a bunch of birds. I know you won't.

LILY I. REZNIK, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS (AUSTIN)

```
1
                        You know, y'all have really been a very good jury, been
10:42:39
             very attentive. I think y'all are really good and I'm not -- I
10:42:42
             usually say that, but this time I really mean it. So I'm proud
10:42:45
             of y'all. And I'm not proud of the government's case here. I
10:42:49
             think it amounts to proof less than proof beyond a reasonable
10:42:52
          5
             doubt.
10:42:57
          6
          7
10:43:04
                        Well, I'm going to sit down now. And I'm sure as soon
             as I sit down, which always happens, I think of the things that I
10:43:06
          8
10:43:09
          9
             didn't think to say. But you've got your 12 memories and you can
         10
             remember what all these witnesses said, and you look at it and
10:43:14
             you decide. You know, it's very serious stuff for Mr. Longoria.
         11
10:43:18
10:43:23
         12
             And I do appreciate your time and your attention. Thank you.
10:43:26
         13
                        THE COURT: Ms. Douglas.
         14
                       MS. DOUGLAS:
                                      Thank you.
10:43:28
             GOVERNMENT'S CLOSING STATEMENTS
10:43:29
         15
10:43:30
         16
                       MS. DOUGLAS: May it please the Court, Mr. Orr, Mr.
         17
             Crawford.
10:43:33
10:43:33
         18
                        I will say this, Mr. Orr is a good boost for my ego.
                                                                                 Ι
         19
             appreciate all the compliments he's given me. And I have the
10:43:39
             most respect for Mr. Orr. As he said, I've known him many years,
10:43:41
         20
         21
             and he has an obligation to his client to do the best job he can
10:43:44
         22
             in defending him. But I will respectfully disagree with him that
10:43:47
             we both just want to win.
10:43:51
         23
         2.4
                        I want you all to return a verdict of quilty because I
10:43:54
             believe the evidence has established that he's quilty. I don't
10:43:57
         25
```

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

10:43:59

10:44:04

10:44:07

10:44:10

10:44:13

10:44:16

10:44:20

10:44:26

10:44:30

10:44:34

10:44:38

10:44:42

10:44:46

10:44:48

10:44:52

10:44:56

10:44:58

10:45:01

10:45:05

10:45:09

10:45:13

10:45:15

10:45:20

10:45:24

10:45:27

just want to win for some notch on my belt. That's not what I'm here for. I'm here to see that justice is served. And justice will be for you to return a verdict of guilty against Arthur Longoria.

I'd like to address a few things that Mr. Orr said in his closing argument to you, then I'm going to get to what I believe the main focus should be. He wants to say how artful and crafty Jonathan Lee is. You all can walk away with your own impressions. I don't find Jonathan Lee to be this artful, crafty kind of gentleman. He's made some poor choices in his life, but the bottom line is when he came in here, he did attempt to minimize Arthur Longoria's responsibility. And what does that tell you? They were friends. They were friends for the last two to three years. He sold him the firearm. He didn't realize it was against the law. Arthur Longoria knows it's against the law for him to possess a firearm.

And so, when he speaks with Detective Skolaut and he's like, well, I sold it to him, it might have been for Loretta, but he came and told you under oath, when I sold it to him, he gave me the money, he took the firearms, nothing was ever said about Loretta. When's the first time something gets said about these are a gift for Loretta? You heard him tell you. After Art's house was raided, Arthur comes over to where he is at his Jiffy Lube job and it's like, hey, do you think you can maybe tell them it was for Loretta's birthday? So take that for whatever you

want, but the bottom line is, Jonathan Lee sold them to Arthur Longoria, and they remained in his possession up until the raid of his home in December for six months. I believe he said her birthday's in August so from August all the way through December. So for four months.

He wants to talk about the constitutional rights of Loretta. That's fine and good. Loretta made a choice. And we talked about that when we began this trial, when we did opening statement, we make choices, choices have consequences, and we have to accept our responsibility for them. You didn't hear from her that, oh-oh, I didn't know he was a convicted felon, none of that. So he's a convicted felon, he knows he can't possess a firearm. They're not able to have a firearm there that he's able to have access to because I'll show you in the charge that the Court gave you, nowhere does it say anything about ownership. It talks about possession.

So in Mr. Longoria's mind, he thinks if he says it's Loretta's, then he gets a free pass. But the law does not indicate that in the Court's charge that Judge Sparks has given you all the elements that we're required to prove. And I would submit to you when you go back in there, your job is somewhat easy because this hasn't been a case that's been hotly contested on, well, it's a case of mistaken identity, or this isn't really a firearm, or any of those things.

So when you look through it -- and you'll have your

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

10:47:09

10:47:14

10:47:17

10:47:22

10:47:27

10:47:30

10:47:32

10:47:35

10:47:38

10:47:41

10:47:43

10:47:47

10:47:59

10:48:01

10:48:05

10:48:08

10:48:16

10:48:20

10:48:23

10:48:29

10:48:33

10:48:37

10:48:41

10:48:44

10:48:46

copy back there. But I'm on page 6. It talks about, first, that the defendant knowingly possessed a firearm, specifically, a Hi-Point, Model CF380, and it goes on with a serial number, and it says before this possession, he has been convicted in court of a felony. He stipulated, so you don't even have to spend any time thinking about that when you go back and deliberate. That's stipulated, that's a fact. You can move on.

No. 3, that the possession of the firearm was affecting commerce. That's not been stipulated. There's not been any evidence that, no, this firearm was really manufactured at some gunsmith here in Texas. So the only thing you have to focus in on is whether or not Mr. Longoria possessed this firearm.

I want you all to go look at that CD. That's why it's in evidence. It's a whole 16 minutes. Take some time and look at it. I've looked at it numerous times. My interpretation of it is a lot different than Mr. Orr's. I don't believe that Mr. Longoria's being truthful. And these are my interpretations, but when he's talking to the police officer about how these firearms came into his possession, his words are, it was a gift for my wife for her birthday. Now, you all may not find that to be as interesting as I do, but the way you word it, it was a gift, that doesn't imply that wife purchased it. That's just a commonsense reading of those words. If she had purchased it, he initially would have been like, my wife bought that. But why did she buy them? She bought them for her birthday. That's just how I

interpret it.

So when the officer whose interpretation is the same as mine says, oh, you bought them for your wife. Then Mr. Longoria realizes, oh-oh, I'm now putting those in my hands if I say I bought them for her for her birthday. So then he says, well, she bought them for herself for her birthday. So I just say that when you're looking through it, look and see what he means when he says the things he says and why he says them.

Then the next thing I find very interesting, look at it, when the officer's trying to figure out how we find "Tater," why does Arthur Longoria think it's important to minimize that he knows "Tater"? Because he doesn't want the police officer to go find him and confirm or refute the story that he's given. He's like, oh, maybe ten times. I don't know how to reach him. He knew how to reach him when he wanted to go over there and talk to him in March. He went right to his place of employment. You didn't hear him tell the police officer, I don't know his number, but I know he works at the Jiffy Lube off of Slaughter.

Why is he trying to hide later from the place? Because he knows "Tater's" not going to lie for him. He knows that if Tater's pinned out, he's going to tell that he sold the firearms to Arthur Longoria.

And finally, Arthur Longoria tells you on that tape that the guns were always in the safe. Well, we know that's not true, and we know it's not true because when the police raided

that home on December 4th, year 2007, they find the gun and these pretty intimidating-looking knives. I don't know Loretta, but they want you to think she's this Angelina Jolie-type lady; she's using guns and knives and she's protecting the home. That just flies in the face of reason and common sense.

I want to end my closing in talking to you about choices. The defendant took actions in his life that concluded with him being a convicted felon. Those are choices he's made, he has to accept the responsibility for it. He chose to purchase two firearms from Jonathan Lee. He knew he was a convicted felon. If he's really just being a great friend, no, I can't buy your firearms to help you out with rent, but here, I'm going to loan you 150, have at it. He didn't have to take those firearms. He chose to keep those firearms in the bedroom where he stayed.

His consequences as a convicted felon, that's one of the rights you lose. Once you become a convicted felon, you never have the opportunity or a right to possess a firearm again. He violated that law the minute he purchased those firearms. The minute he purchased them, he violated that law. And you heard from Agent Daniel Jones with ATF, Mr. Longoria knew he couldn't go into Academy and say, I'd like to buy these for my wife for her birthday. I mean do we really think that convicted felons won't come in and lie? This isn't for me, it's for my wife for her birthday. Okay.

Responsibility. To this day, he's not accepting

10:52:06

25

10:52:10

responsibility for his actions. In the law it does not talk about ownership because if it did, then every convicted felon could circumvent the law. And we talked a little earlier, I think it was Mr. Orr, maybe some of the jurors, when we were talking about loopholes or someone got up on the witness stand, I remember that coming out.

government has to establish whose gun it is, who's owning it. talks about possession because, otherwise, the Longorias of the world could say, okay, wife, go buy this gun at Academy, then I'll have a bill of sale, I'll have documentation that it's your firearm so we could have it at our house all day long. I'll have access to it, can do whatever I want to it, but if the police say something, I'm like it's not my gun. But that's not the law. The law is possession. And the Judge gives you a definition of possession, whether it's on your person or your ability to exercise control over it.

I think it's somewhat, once again, of not taking responsibility. We want to talk all about Jonathan Lee being this big-time gun seller, like he's buying firearms, selling them. He told you seven or eight firearms over the course of two to three years that he sold, trade, et cetera, or needed money for. If he's making 100, 150 at a pop, is that how you make a living for two to three years? It's not reasonable.

LILY I. REZNIK, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS (AUSTIN)

But we get back to responsibility. Even if that's 1 10:53:39 true, how does that take away Arthur Longoria's responsibility 10:53:44 for purchasing the firearm? He wants you look at everybody else 10:53:48 3 except for him. And I would ask you not to allow him to shirk 10:53:52 his responsibility. He's a convicted felon. He's not allowed to 10:53:57 5 possession firearms, and the evidence has established that he 10:54:01 6 7 possessed a firearm from when Jonathan Lee sold it to him, all 10:54:04 the way until the police went to his home on December 4th, year 10:54:08 8 10:54:13 9 2007, and found him with that firearm. I ask you to return a 10 verdict of quilty. Thank you. 10:54:17 11 THE COURT: Now, members of the jury, I'm going to 10:54:22 reverse myself and tell you it's time to talk about this case. 10:54:25 12 10:54:35 13 And I'll have the security officer, Mr. Hall, sworn, please. 10:54:42 14 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you'll 10:54:47 15 keep this jury during their retirement in some convenient place, 10:54:50 16 removed from the presence of others; and that you will not 10:54:53 17 without leave of court allow anyone to speak to them; that you 10:54:56 18 will not without leave of court speak to them yourself except to 19 ascertain whether they have agreed upon their verdict and to 10:55:00 20 attend to their desire for necessities; that you will well and 10:55:02 21 faithfully discharge your duties of this court, so help you God? 10:55:06 10:55:10 2.2 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: I will. 23 THE COURT: Place you in Mr. Hall's custody. When you 10:55:11 are through rendering a verdict, advise him, give him any 2.4 10:55:18 25 communication. Ms. Juday, and, Mr. Stegman, y'all are alternate 10:55:28

```
jurors. Do you have anything in the jury room? Okay. I'll have
10:55:35
          1
             you go in with them, get your personal articles. We have to keep
10:55:39
             you in a separate part, but you're still going to be there as a
10:55:46
10:55:52
             juror. And you will not talk with any of the jurors about this
             case at the present time. We'll have a special room for you to
10:56:00
          5
10:56:05
             sit and wait as the jury returns a verdict. So why don't we take
          7
10:56:10
             them in and get their personal articles and then, take them back
10:56:15
          8
             out.
10:56:16
          9
                        All right. All rise for the jury.
         10
                        (Jury retires to deliberate.)
10:56:43
         11
                        THE COURT: Stay within contact with Mrs. Sims. I do
10:56:50
         12
             not require you to stay in the courtroom, or stay in the
10:56:56
10:57:01
         13
             courthouse, but in the event there is any indication, you have to
         14
             be able to get here quickly. So give her your cell numbers.
10:57:04
11:37:32
         15
                        (Recess.)
11:37:57
         16
                        THE COURT: I've received jury note No. 1: We've
         17
             selected a foreperson, Michael Bowers.
11:38:00
         18
                        And jury note No. 2: We have come to a verdict.
11:38:04
         19
                        Bring them in.
11:38:09
         20
                        (Jury present.)
11:38:10
         21
             VERDICT
11:39:04
         2.2
                        THE COURT: Has the jury come to a verdict?
11:39:04
                                    Yes, your Honor, we have.
11:39:10
         2.3
                        THE JUROR:
                                    Is it a unanimous verdict?
11:39:11
         2.4
                        THE COURT:
11:39:12
         25
                        THE JUROR:
                                    Yes, sir.
```

```
1
                        THE COURT: Mrs. Sims will come get it. Have you
11:39:13
             signed it, sir?
11:39:16
                        THE JUROR:
11:39:16
          3
                                    Yes, sir.
                        THE COURT:
                                    I'll have the clerk read the verdict.
11:39:29
          4
          5
                        THE CLERK: Answer as to Question No. 1, guilty, signed
11:39:32
             this 12th day of August, 2008, at 11:30 a.m., Michael Bowers,
11:39:40
          6
          7
11:39:46
             presiding juror.
                        THE COURT: Anybody want the verdict -- the jury
11:39:47
          8
11:39:50
          9
             polled?
         10
                        MS. DOUGLAS: No, your Honor.
11:39:51
         11
                        MR. ORR: No, your Honor.
11:39:53
         12
                        THE COURT: Members of the jury, now I'm going to
11:39:54
11:39:57
         13
             release you from your confidentiality, which means that you could
         14
             talk about the case, if you want to, with anybody that you want
11:40:00
11:40:03
         15
             to. It's America. On the other hand, you also have the right
11:40:07
         16
             not to talk to anybody. I always encourage the jurors if the
         17
             lawyers ask you a question to talk with them, but if you prefer
11:40:10
         18
             not, all you have to do is say, "I prefer not to talk about the
11:40:14
         19
             case."
11:40:17
         20
                        I have from time to time jurors who get concerned about
11:40:19
         21
             being on a jury, but I could tell you that since 1963, when I've
11:40:23
         22
             been actively involved as a lawyer, and now as a judge for all
11:40:29
             these years, I've never seen a single juror even bothered by
11:40:32
         23
             anybody in Texas. Now, you read about it in California, but
         2.4
11:40:39
             everything goes on in California. So I'm not responsible for
         25
11:40:44
```

```
1
                   But if you don't want to talk about the case, you don't
11:40:47
             have to, and just tell the lawyers you prefer not. If the
11:40:50
             lawyers ask you a question about what they did was good, or bad,
11:40:56
          3
             or anything like that, it doesn't hurt to get an objective
11:40:59
             viewpoint from somebody who comes in and is a juror in the case,
11:41:04
          5
11:41:07
             but that's up to you.
          7
11:41:09
                        I have one more administrative responsibility for you
             and the alternate jurors in the jury room. You'll be through in
11:41:11
          8
11:41:17
          9
             about five minutes. And you have the thanks of the Court for
         10
             this service. And place you back in Mr. Hall's authority.
11:41:20
11:41:52
         11
                        (Jury exits.)
         12
                        THE COURT: I'll accept the verdict, file it with the
11:42:02
11:42:04
         13
             clerk, and we'll set sentencing in this case for October 17th.
         14
             October 17th, Friday, at 9:00.
11:42:09
11:42:11
         15
                        MR. ORR: Yes, your Honor.
                        THE COURT: Counsel, thank you for the professional way
11:42:12
         16
         17
             that you treated the Court. And you are excused.
11:42:14
         18
                        (End of proceedings.)
         19
         20
         21
         22
         23
         24
         25
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT)
 5
    WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 6
 7
       I, LILY I. REZNIK, Official Court Reporter, United States
 8
    District Court, Western District of Texas, do certify that the
 9
    foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings
10
    in the above-entitled matter.
11
       I certify that the transcript fees and format comply with
12
    those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the
    United States.
13
14
       WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND this the 23rd day of February, 2009.
15
16
17
                                       /s/Lily I. Reznik
                                      LILY I. REZNIK, RPR, CRR
18
                                      Official Court Reporter
                                      United States District Court
19
                                      Austin Division
                                      200 W. 8th Street, 2nd Floor
20
                                      Austin, Texas 78701
                                       (512)916-5564
2.1
                                      Certification No. 4481
                                      Expires: 12-31-10
22
23
24
25
```